

Y885R
3. J88
1977
cop. 2

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY IN SOUTH
CAROLINA

Based on Uniform Crime Reports - 1977

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Based on

Uniform Crime Reports - 1977

S. C. STATE LIBRARY
DEC 14 1978
STATE DOCUMENTS

Barbara R. LaBelle
Research and Evaluation Unit
S. C. Department of Youth Services
August, 1978

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY IN SOUTH CAROLINA
BASED ON UNIFORM CRIME REPORT - 1977

I. INTRODUCTION

This study represents an update of the report issued last year by the Department of Youth Services regarding juveniles taken into custody by law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. The information is based primarily on the Uniform Crime Reports, collected and compiled by the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division from reports submitted by law enforcement agencies throughout the State. Since June, 1976, SLED has extracted the juvenile data from the statewide Uniform Crime Report and furnished it to the Research and Evaluation Unit of the South Carolina Department of Youth Services for compilation and analyzation.

Certainly, the statistics in the Uniform Crime Report are not an index of crimes committed by juveniles, which is unknown, but rather reflect the incidence of reported crime and, therefore, represent those youth actually taken into custody. It has been estimated by national sources that the crime rates are perhaps double those as reported by the UCR. Nevertheless, this report presents a vehicle for viewing aggregate data relating to that segment of the juvenile justice system where juveniles first enter via law enforcement agencies and which accounts for the greatest number of juvenile referrals to the court.

Through the data compiled in this study, first, an attempt has been made to analyze the various demographic characteristics of those offenders taken into

custody by law enforcement agencies during 1977, inclusive of age, race, sex and mean age. In addition, attention is given to the proportion of juvenile population which has been apprehended as reported by the UCR, the various offenses with which juveniles were charged during 1977, and the disposition of those taken into custody as made by the individual law enforcement agencies. Further, comparisons have been drawn between 1977 and 1976 in relationship to the aforementioned areas. The majority of the tables reflect individual counties' distributions in the various categories, since for the sake of brevity, the individual summary sheets and tables provided for specific counties in last year's report have been omitted.

The available information also affords some comparisons statewide between "arrests" and other components of the juvenile justice system, such as detention, court referrals, commitments to the Reception and Evaluation Center and correctional schools of the Department of Youth Services. It is important to note, however, that these various elements maintain different reporting mechanisms, subject to both individual county variances and practices as well as accuracy in reporting. However, considering that we now have more substantial baseline information available from all of the areas after several years of reporting, it is important to at least attempt to correlate in some manner the separate "links" in the juvenile justice system as they operate in South Carolina so that we might better perceive any apparent trends in trying to understand more fully what is happening to that population of our youth who find themselves in trouble.

Finally, an attempt has also been made to interpret these findings into some meaningful conclusions based on the limited knowledge that we have, as well as indicating any direction or trends that can be determined from our data bases. It should also be noted that for convenience sake, references

may be made at times to "arrests" as indicated by the UCR, although, technically by law juveniles are not arrested but "taken into custody".

II. ANALYZATION OF UCR DATA - 1977

According to the Uniform Crime Report, 8,544 youths through age 16 were arrested in South Carolina during 1977. This accounts for 1.67% of the estimated juvenile population between the ages of 7 and 16 (512,519). These figures may be compared to the UCR data for 1976 which indicated a total of 10,767 juveniles arrested through age 16 and, therefore, reflects over a 20% decrease in 1977 of the numbers of juveniles apprehended. This trend appears to be carrying over into 1978, as well, since the UCR first quarter 1978 figures indicate that 1,729 youths are reported to have been arrested as compared to 2,101 youths for the same period of time last year. If this pattern is sustained during the entire year, it is apparent that the juvenile "arrest" figures will continue to decline by perhaps another 19% in 1978.

The decrease in numbers of juveniles taken into custody is even more notable when viewing the categories of status offenses only, with a significant decrease of over 30% from 1976 indicated. Of course, it must be considered that the only status arrests recorded as such on the UCR are "running away" and "curfew and loitering offenses." Nevertheless, since that was the same data that was incorporated for 1976, the declining figures would be presumed to have validity unless the methodology of reporting some of those status offenses has been modified by certain law enforcement agencies.

Looking at the individual counties, it is clear that the majority of them experienced substantial decreases in the number of juveniles taken into custody, particularly when examining those counties with reporting figures large enough to indicate some real change. For example, although Greenville, Richland, Spartanburg, and Horry experienced notable decreases, Charleston had very little

change. The only county which indicated a gross exception to the declining trend was Sumter whose figures indicate a vast increase in the numbers of juveniles taken into custody for 1977.

While the data on status arrests, as would be expected, exhibit primarily the same consistent decreases in numbers, several large counties do not display the increase or decrease in accord with the data recorded for all arrests. As for example, while Anderson County indicated very little change in all arrests, there was a notable increase in status arrests. Charleston County, although experiencing little fluctuation between 1976 and 1977 figures for all arrests, however, indicated a very notable decrease for status arrests only. Greenville and Richland Counties figures represent approximately the same proportion of decline for status arrests as for all arrests, while Horry County demonstrated a more vast decrease in status arrests only. Lexington, conversely, while noting little change in all arrests, exhibited a significant increase in status arrests only.

While, as would be expected, the largest number of juveniles taken into custody was reported for the largest counties, it is interesting to note that according to the percentage of the estimated juvenile population, ages 7 to 16 in that county, the ranking differs somewhat. Although Richland County remains number one for both the numbers and the percentage of the juvenile population arrested (4.08), it is followed by Horry (3.73), Anderson (3.06), Charleston (2.85), Sumter (2.61), York (2.24), and Union (2.16). All of these counties rank above the statewide percentage of all juveniles taken into custody in proportion to the estimated juvenile population of the State (1.67). It might be remembered, however, also, that other factors play contributing roles into the number of juveniles taken into custody. For instance, in many of these locales there are special juvenile units which may be devoting a greater

part of their time to the apprehension of juveniles. In addition, it is important to correlate this arrest data with the disposition data for each individual county since some of these larger counties may, in fact, be handling a greater proportion of these juveniles within their own department and then releasing them, resulting in what actually may be termed "diversion".

The age distribution of the juveniles reported taken into custody indicates that over one-third of those arrested were in the 16 year old age group. The next most common age group was the 13 - 14 year olds with 28.45%, followed by the 15 year olds with 24.77%. Less than 13% of the juveniles were under age 13 and the mean age of all children taken into custody was 14.363 years. A comparison with the 1976 UCR figures reveals basically the same pattern in the age distributions, with little proportional differences, even though the difference in raw numbers was greatest for the 10 and under age group.

In terms of sex configuration, males outnumbered females approximately three to one, which appears to be consistent with the experiences noted by most juvenile justice agencies. This 3 to 1 ratio fluctuates only slightly from that noted for 1976 and has remained fairly stable over the last several years.

The distributions according to race are estimated figures since accurate UCR figures on race for all years preceding 1978 has been carried only inclusive of age 17. However, it has been statistically determined that these approximate percentages would also apply proportionally through age 16. The estimates in terms of race statewide, reflect an approximate 61% white and 39% black distribution. These figures differ only slightly from those reported for 1976, with an increase of about one percentage point in the non-white population. Comparisons by age, sex and race of the arrest data for 1977 with other components of the juvenile justice system are analyzed further on in this report.

STATE DOCUMENTS
DEC 14 1978

The offense data should not be construed as being entirely representative, since there are many discrepancies in the reporting of these categories. As has been noted in national studies done on the total UCR, there is much discretion on the part of the recording officer as to the offense reported which may vary between locales. Also, only one offense is reported per person, essentially the primary or more severe offense when there may be several others involved. Further, a large number of offenses are recorded in the "other" category and, therefore, are unknown. In addition, the category of "offense against family and children" appears to be rather an obscure issue and used rather indiscriminately according to some law enforcement personnel. Finally, it will be noted that the only categories of status offenses that the UCR provides for are "runaway" and "curfew and loitering", thereby making it difficult to correlate status offenses as denoted by the UCR with those five categories of runaway, truancy, incorrigibility, curfew and loitering, and possession of liquor, which are utilized by the detention facilities as well as the courts and the Department of Youth Services. All of these are data limitations which must be considered.

The UCR information incorporated here, however, reveals that the largest number of youths were charged with "larceny", accounting for 2,331, or over 27% of all offenses. Breaking and entering was the next largest category with 1,369 or 16% of the offenses, followed by the "other" classification with almost 13%. The status offenses alone accounted for 947 or about 11% of the total number of offenses. Only a few counties had sizeable proportions of status offenders; Anderson (17%), Greenville (16.6%), Jasper (55%), Kershaw (27%), Lexington (39%), and Spartanburg (14.6%).

In comparing the offense distribution for 1977 with that of the previous year, little difference is noted in the major offense categories. However, in some

of the offense categories there appeared to be fluctuations both proportionately and, in some cases, in raw differences. As an example, in the category of "other assaults", while the raw difference was indicated by an increase in 84 or 42%, proportionately this category accounted for approximately 1.5% more of the offenses in 1977 than in 1976. Drug abuse violations, while decreasing almost 24% in the raw figures, proportionately remained consistent with last year's figures. There appeared to be a large decrease in the category of "offenses against family and children" both proportionately and, very emphatically, in the percentage of raw difference, declining some 89%. It may be possible, however, that the interpretation for the recording of this offense has changed among the law enforcement agencies as it has been indicated previously in this report that this category has been somewhat nebulous to define. As also earlier stated, both categories of status offenses, the "curfew and loitering law" as well as "runaway" decreased substantially from last year.

The dispositions of the juveniles arrested as reported by the law enforcement agencies in South Carolina reveal a facet of documentation that is most important. This total issue of police disposition was addressed for the first time in the 1976 report, but the reporting was not consistent for all counties or law enforcement agencies and therefore, more dispositions were actually recorded than total arrests last year. In this year's 1977 report, there are no such discrepancies, and, therefore, presents a more valid base to utilize. It is apparent on a statewide base that over 75% of the juveniles taken into custody by law enforcement agencies were referred to the juvenile court or probation department. As a matter of fact, in most counties the proportion referred to the juvenile court exceeded this statewide percentage with the exception of several large counties such as Anderson (53.2%), Horry (67.0%), and Richland (58.8%). From last year's report it was estimated that about 65%

of the arrest dispositions were made to the juvenile courts or probation departments, and that 28% of the law enforcement juvenile arrests were being handled within the agencies themselves without necessitating court action at that time. These figures relative to what realistically might be called "diversion", seem to have decreased about 5% this year as well as a similar decrease in number of referrals to other social agencies. This does not appear to hold true in Anderson and Richland, however, where substantially large percentages of the youths taken into custody still are being handled within the department and released. Very few referrals were made to other agencies (only 20 or 0.2%) and, of particular note, is the large decrease in the numbers referred to criminal or adult court (24 or 0.3%), differing greatly from the 4% of all dispositions noted last year which were referred to criminal or adult court. In no county were more than 4 youths referred to criminal or adult court during 1977 as indicated by the UCR.

This information on dispositions implies strongly that the advent of the Uniform Court System in July, 1977, has had significant impact on police handling of youths taken into custody even for the six month time frame included in the 1977 records. The data reflecting increased utilization of the juvenile court is further supported by the figures indicating both 1) a decrease in law enforcement "self-handling", and 2) a vast decrease in referrals of cases involving serious offenses to criminal or adult court, even though the proportions of youth taken into custody for those type offenses have remained relatively stable. This trend is particularly apparent in counties previously without family courts.

III. COMPARISONS IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

As has been discussed previously in this report, it is somewhat difficult to correlate the data concerning the various segments of the juvenile justice

system in South Carolina. However, since there is now baseline data available for periods of several years, comparisons of certain statistical data concerning "arrests", youth detained in jail, those referred through the court and those committed by the court to the Reception and Evaluation Center and correctional schools do elicit some relevant information.

As an example, data is now available over a two year period of time in which to compare trends between those youth who have been detained in jail during 1976 and 1977 with those who were taken into custody for the same periods of time. On a statewide basis, it is noted that about 10% less youths were detained in jail than were recorded as arrested by the UCR for 1977, as compared to 28% in 1976. The fluctuation in the detention figures is minute, whereas, as has been already discussed, "arrests" have declined sharply. Since it might be assumed that only those youth arrested on serious charges would be incarcerated in jail detention, the further expectation, therefore, would be for detention to decline at least at some rate approximating that of "arrests". As has been noted, this has not been the case, which in large part may be attributed to the still large proportion of status offenders who are detained in jail. The majority of these status offenders are never recorded via the UCR, either since they are never formally "arrested" or are booked into the "other" category. It is also interesting to note that the patterns for the individual counties fluctuate greatly in comparing these two areas in the juvenile justice system. For instance, it can be seen that only about 15 counties approximated the same levels of increase or decrease in both components. (Comparable level of increase - Anderson, Bamberg, Barnwell, Cherokee, Fairfield, McCormick, and Saluda.) (Comparable level of decrease - Abbeville, Colleton, Kershaw, Lee, Marion, Oconee, Orangeburg, Pickens.) Conversely, in another 15 counties the detention rates increased while the level of arrests decreased (Berkeley, Chester, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Darlington, Dillon, Dorchester, Georgetown, Lancaster, Lexington, Marlboro,

Spartanburg, Union, Williamsburg, York). In another 9 counties, although decreases were demonstrated in both components, the "arrest" rate decline greatly exceeded that of detention (Aiken, Beaufort, Florence, Greenville, Greenwood, Hampton, Horry, Laurens, Richland). In only two counties (Charleston and Allendale) were the decreases for detention more notable, and in only one county (Sumter) did the arrest figures increase at a much more prelevant rate than detention.

Reference now is made to some broader comparisons of data among components of the juvenile justice system for 1977. Initially, in examining the base rate of the youth who have been processed through these various components relative to the estimated 1976 juvenile population between 7 and 16, it is apparent from the close congruity of 1977 figures representing arrests and detention that both rates approximate 1.5 percent of that estimated juvenile population. This may be compared to juvenile court referrals for calendar year 1977 which is estimated at almost twice the size of either of the previous two components and, therefore, reflects a rate of over 3% of the estimated juvenile population. The commitments to the Reception and Evaluation Center for calendar year 1977 account for 1635 youths constituting .44% of the estimated juvenile population of the State between 10 and 16, and commitments to the correctional schools of the Department of Youth Services, an approximate 40% lowered rate of .18 of that same statewide population. It will be noted that the latter two rates are based on the estimated juvenile population in the State age 10 through 16, while those of the other components of the juvenile justice system are based on the age grouping between 7 and 16. It is assumed that these differing base lines would be more accurate, since, although juveniles may be arrested, detained in jail, or referred to the courts starting at age 7, commitments to residential institutions are prohibited under age 10.

An examination of race, sex and age factors in the various juvenile justice system components reveals basically similar distribution for these particular characteristics. In terms of race, the data indicates that essentially the proportions of juveniles arrested, held in detention, and referred through the courts, differ very marginally either from each other or from that representative portion of the juvenile population at large as well. However, it is apparent that at the point on the juvenile justice system continuum of commitments to the Reception and Evaluation Center, the proportion of black youths committed increases some 10%, followed by another 10% increase at the point of commitments to a correctional school. This issue has been addressed in detail in a study by the Research and Evaluation Unit completed recently in which it was found in analyzing commitments to these facilities by race and by offense that there was substantial evidence indicating that black youth were more frequently charged with serious offenses. (For further detail, refer to the study entitled "Analysis of the Relationship Between Offense and Race of Youth in the Juvenile Justice System", July, 1978.)

The sex distribution also exhibits a strong parallel in terms of arrests, detention, courts, and R & E commitments, while indicating that the proportion of males increases about 10% at the point of correctional commitments. This approximate three to one male/female ratio of youths processed through the juvenile justice system has been relatively stable for many years, even though the male/female proportion of the juvenile population at large is nearly equal. However, some increase in the proportion of females detained has been noted over the last few years, particularly in regard to status offenders, and, as can be seen from this data, reflects the highest proportion of females processed through the system.

The age comparisons also indicate fairly even patterns. The mean age is strikingly similar in all components of the system, and only the modal age for

the R & E Center commitments is somewhat lower than the other areas. The age groupings themselves, also exhibit similar proportions in the 13 and 14 age groups as well as 15 and 16.

The analyzation of the correlation between the proportions of status and non-status offenders processed through the various components of the juvenile justice system must be considered with some reservations, as to the validity of all of the data. While the figures from the R & E Center admissions and those of the correctional schools as well as the input from detention essentially represent their baselines, it will be noted that the figures for the courts are based on the proportion of offenses, rather than offenders, since this was the only data available from the courts with reasonable accuracy. In addition, as has been previously noted, the UCR data only utilizes two categories of status offenders, "runaways" and "curfew violations". Therefore, it is unknown how many of the individual offenses placed in the "other" category might, in reality, be attributed to status offenders. Nevertheless, it would appear reasonable from the available figures that the proportion of status offenders is most similar for detention, R & E Center admissions, and those processed through the court as well. From the lack of clarity in categorizing status offenders in the UCR, it would be expected that the percentage of status offenders "arrested" would be much smaller. Further, with the emphasis on the deinstitutionalization of status offenders during the past several years, it is not surprising that the proportion of status offenders admitted to the correctional schools during calendar year 1977 is so low and in fact would almost be non-existent if the figures from the first half of 1977 were omitted.

A final comparison in the juvenile justice system merits attention in considering a sample of the data indicating law enforcement referrals to the juvenile or family court as reported by the UCR and, conversely, from the court reports

of those referrals recorded from law enforcement, both based on fiscal year 1977 reports. It should be noted that the UCR figures differ from those utilized in our earlier analyzation of children taken into custody based on UCR in this report since those figures were for calendar year 1977. However, since the same information was not available on the calendar year from the courts, fiscal year figures were compiled for the sample in order to provide the same baseline data.

It is apparent that the sample counties differed little from the total state in either the proportions of youths referred to the court as recorded by the UCR, or in the court reported referrals from law enforcement. It is evident also that the proportion of the referrals of the law enforcement agencies to the courts differed significantly from that proportion of the court load which has been recorded as referrals from law enforcement. This is easily understood when considering that the court processes youths as referrals from so many other sources. However, the most interesting facet of the sample comparison pertains to the raw numbers that are recorded from both agencies involved, in relationship to these law enforcement referrals to the court. Although the referrals from law enforcement as reported by the court in every county except York reflect a larger number, in only 4 of the 12 counties sampled did the numbers even approximate one another (Anderson, Orangeburg, Spartanburg, and York). In the other eight counties, the disparity between the figures is of such magnitude that probably only two interpretations are possible. While one simple explanation might be that the recording in the courts is highly erroneous, a more plausible implication relates to the vast numbers of youths who may be referred on an informal basis to the court without benefit of having been booked officially on the UCR. As a case in point, one might consider particularly Beaufort and Clarendon Counties where it has been known, prior to fiscal year 1977 that the courts were receiving

great numbers of law enforcement referrals predominately for youths with "problems". It should prove to be most informative to track the follow-up reports for fiscal 1978 from the same courts this year in order to assess any differences resulting from the establishment of the uniform court system.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

As was emphasized in the first study completed last year on "Juveniles in Custody", with the information presented, the questions to be addressed revolve around the meaning of this data, the inferences from it, the current problem areas, and what options are available to juvenile justice practitioners in meeting the needs of these youths involved. Since then, our base of juvenile justice data has been broadened both by the extension of time so that we have more comparable information available, as well as some refinement in the reporting systems to provide a more accurate interpretation of the data. Thus, several significant observations are manifest, even while recognizing the data limitations.

First, the juvenile population in the age groups 7 - 16 has demonstrated a slow decline since 1970 and is projected to continue that trend. Secondly, it is obvious that, aggregate-wise, the numbers of children taken into custody by law enforcement agencies continue to decline steadily at a substantial rate of about 15 - 20% per year, or at least has been so indicated from the UCR over the last several years. Next, the two-year base of detention data, which may be construed to represent "reasonable estimates" of that particular component, reflects a static pattern, with little perceptible change. Further, the best available estimates of the numbers of youth processed through the courts also basically reveal a uniformity over the last several years. Finally, in relationship to youths committed to the Department of Youth Services, while R & E temporary commitments reflect nearly parallel numbers over the last several years, commitments to the correctional schools have significantly

declined overall and most particularly in regard to status offenders. Thus, the deinstitutionalization of status offenders program has impacted heavily on this part of the Juvenile Justice System.

In regard to the characteristics of the juvenile population processed through the "system," the hypothesis has been confirmed that the juvenile offender populations in South Carolina, whether considering those arrested, detained, or processed through the court, still reflect very similar characteristics in distribution to age, race and sex proportionately within each group. The offense data also exhibits many similarities among the groups of youth processed through the various components. The greatest single demographic disparity emerges from study of the populations committed to the Reception and Evaluation Center and the correctional schools of the Department of Youth Services, in that the race variable at the point of commitments exhibits considerable variance from the other groups and is an issue previously analyzed.

In reality, therefore, how far have we really progressed during this last year? The wheels of the juvenile justice system still turn slowly and are still failing to meet the needs of many of our "troubled youth", particularly at the court level where the responsibility for these youth so critically influences the course of their lives.

Many questions still remain unanswered. Although the impact of deinstitutionalization of status offenders has been obvious from the data on correctional schools, why do we still have so many in detention? With the juvenile population and reported arrests declining, why is the court population remaining relatively stable? Is the uniform court system, ostensibly established to provide for more equal treatment of youth, actually drawing more minor offenders into the system? Are we really diverting youth and where? How can we measure the full impact of social agencies and Youth Service Bureaus?

We are more knowledgeable, perhaps, than previously about the juvenile justice system and its operations in South Carolina, and are attempting to address the pressing issues of uniformity in our reporting systems so that we will have a continuity of reporting that will serve with greater validity for both predictive and planning purposes. But we are still a long way from dealing with the inherent problems with great expertise. We cannot yet track youth through the juvenile justice system, as it is still composed of various separate elements, even though a unified system would enable us to advance our planning and implementation of programs which is now being inhibited by the hindrances apparent in our present cumbersome system. Further, the "system" is still marked by a lack of communications between the agencies involved with youth and their problems and so much potential, rather, is devoted to agency self-interest. It is indeed a frustrating situation when not yet is there even universal agreement on operational definitions of such terms as "detention," "recidivism," "juvenile population," "diversion," or even "status offender."

Finally, we are still lacking in solid research effort in this State to determine what our programs are doing and the direction in which we should be going. There is also well supported evidence to indicate that decision makers pay too little attention to national efforts in program experience and documented results in order to determine or, better yet, modify with credibility programs that would enhance the likelihood of rehabilitating our youth once they have penetrated the system. It seems that too often not only do youth repeat their own mistakes which doom them in the juvenile justice system, but as practitioners, we err similarly in rehabilitation efforts which not only are doomed to fail in the improvement of the system, but, more importantly, in doing so, fail those very youths for whom we are responsible. It is interesting to observe in this respect that the National Center for Juvenile Justice has also noted this wide

gap between the research community and the practitioner and is developing a major effort this year for dissemination of findings of programs in order to increase the utilization of such research findings by policy makers and practitioners.

It is hoped that as advancements are made in the promulgation of new national standards and goals, as data collection of relevant information in all the areas becomes available, and as agencies and practitioners in juvenile justice systems maximize their capabilities and pool their efforts in realistically dealing with the fundamental issues, that we will build a better system for the best interest of our juveniles.

TABLE I

ARRESTS BY COUNTY

1976-1977 Comparison

County	1976	<u>ALL ARRESTS</u>		1976	<u>STATUS ARRESTS ONLY</u>	
		1977	% Raw Change		1977	% Raw Change
Abbeville	30	20	- 33.3	1	1	0
Aiken	337	128	- 62.0	69	14	- 79.8
Allendale	7	7	0	0	1	+100.0
Anderson	585	594	+ 1.5	82	103	+ 24.4
Bamberg	8	19	+137.5	1	0	-100.0
Barnwell	3	8	+166.7	1	0	-100.0
Beaufort	179	73	- 59.2	13	4	- 69.2
Berkeley	296	70	- 76.4	64	9	- 85.9
Calhoun	4	1	- 75.0	0	0	0
Charleston	1,418	1,419	+ .07	98	55	- 44.9
Cherokee	20	36	+ 80.0	3	4	+ 33.3
Chester	79	49	- 38.0	1	2	+100.0
Chesterfield	39	34	- 12.8	1	0	-100.0
Clarendon	8	4	- 50.0	0	0	0
Colleton	25	21	- 16.0	0	1	+100.0
Darlington	187	166	- 11.2	14	18	+ 28.6
Dillon	67	37	- 44.8	8	7	- 12.5
Dorchester	34	26	- 23.5	2	2	0
Edgefield	18	16	- 11.1	1	0	-100.0
Fairfield	8	8	0	0	0	0
Florence	227	129	- 43.2	37	9	- 75.7
Georgetown	43	34	- 20.9	0	0	0
Greenville	1,201	790	- 34.2	200	131	- 34.5
Greenwood	240	165	- 31.3	21	11	- 47.6
Hampton	41	4	- 90.2	5	0	-100.0
Horry	656	525	- 20.0	196	19	- 90.3
Jasper	28	38	+ 35.7	11	21	+ 90.9
Kershaw	121	114	- 05.8	41	31	- 25.0
Lancaster	114	76	- 33.3	11	7	- 36.4
Laurens	128	55	- 57.0	1	2	+100.0
Lee	14	11	- 21.4	0	0	0
Lexington	237	228	- 03.8	24	89	+270.8
Marion	80	52	- 40.0	3	1	- 66.7
Marlboro	87	32	- 63.2	11	4	- 63.6
McCormick	6	14	+133.3	0	0	0
Newberry	22	25	+ 13.6	3	2	- 33.3
Oconee	39	25	- 35.9	2	0	-100.0
Orangeburg	185	124	- 33.0	8	10	+ 25.0
Pickens	191	150	- 21.5	5	13	+160.0
Richland	2,035	1,601	- 21.3	233	177	- 24.0
Saluda	20	24	+ 20.0	2	0	-100.0
Spartanburg	853	632	- 25.9	115	97	- 15.7
Sumter	255	464	+ 82.0	60	70	+ 16.7
Union	184	120	- 34.8	2	4	+100.0
Williamsburg	15	8	- 46.7	0	0	0
York	393	368	- 06.4	32	29	- 09.4
STATE TOTAL	10,767	8,544	- 20.6	1,382	947	- 31.5

TABLE II

ARRESTS BY COUNTY PERCENTAGE
OF JUVENILE POPULATION

County	Estimated Juvenile Population - 1976	<u>TAKEN INTO CUSTODY</u>	
		Number	Percentage of Population
Abbeville	3,776	20	.53
Aiken	18,460	128	.69
Allendale	1,943	7	.36
Anderson	19,429	594	3.06
Bamberg	3,317	19	.57
Barnwell	3,533	8	.23
Beaufort	9,779	73	.75
Berkeley	14,702	70	.48
Calhoun	2,323	1	.04
Charleston	49,770	1419	2.85
Cherokee	7,117	36	.51
Chester	5,823	49	.84
Chesterfield	7,049	34	.48
Clarendon	5,822	4	.07
Colleton	5,870	21	.36
Darlington	11,109	166	1.49
Dillon	6,603	37	.56
Dorchester	7,345	26	.35
Edgefield	3,332	16	.48
Fairfield	4,251	8	.19
Florence	18,374	129	.70
Georgetown	7,343	34	.46
Greenville	45,408	790	1.74
Greenwood	9,378	165	1.76
Hampton	3,232	4	.12
Horry	14,084	525	3.73
Jasper	2,601	38	1.46
Kershaw	6,915	114	1.65
Lancaster	8,754	76	.87
Laurens	9,068	55	.61
Lee	4,169	11	.26
Lexington	18,493	228	1.23
Marion	6,023	52	.86
Marlboro	6,044	32	.53
McCormick	1,756	14	.80
Newberry	5,069	25	.49
Oconee	7,703	25	.32
Orangeburg	14,591	124	.85
Pickens	10,227	150	1.47
Richland	39,262	1601	4.08
Saluda	2,872	24	.84
Spartanburg	32,370	632	1.95
Sumter	17,744	464	2.61
Union	5,551	120	2.16
Williamsburg	7,699	8	.10
York	16,436	368	2.24
STATE TOTAL	512,519	8544	1.67

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE III

ARRESTS BY COUNTY
BY AGE AND SEX

County	AGE						SEX			
	10 & under	11 & 12	13 & 14	15	16	Total	Male No.	Male %	Female No.	Female %
Abbeville	0	1	1	3	15	20	19	95.0	1	5.0
Aiken	11	8	43	21	45	128	98	76.6	30	23.4
Allendale	0	1	1	2	3	7	3	42.9	4	57.1
Anderson	16	39	178	153	208	594	415	69.9	179	30.1
Bamberg	1	0	2	10	6	19	18	94.7	1	5.3
Barnwell	0	1	2	4	1	8	7	87.5	1	12.5
Beaufort	2	3	28	22	18	73	53	72.6	20	27.4
Berkeley	0	4	24	18	24	70	58	82.9	12	17.1
Calhoun	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	100.0	0	0
Charleston	44	143	408	348	476	1,419	1,116	78.6	303	21.4
Cherokee	0	0	6	9	21	36	34	94.4	2	5.6
Chester	1	5	14	14	15	49	35	71.4	14	28.6
Chesterfield	0	1	9	6	18	34	34	100.0	0	0
Clarendon	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	75.0	1	25.0
Colleton	0	0	2	5	14	21	14	66.7	7	33.3
Darlington	4	15	43	45	59	166	140	84.3	26	15.7
Dillon	1	1	9	9	17	37	32	86.5	5	13.5
Dorchester	0	0	9	6	11	26	18	69.2	8	30.8
Edgefield	0	0	3	5	8	16	16	100.0	0	0
Fairfield	0	0	4	1	3	8	8	100.0	0	0
Florence	4	8	22	31	64	129	94	72.9	35	27.1
Georgetown	2	1	8	11	12	34	28	82.4	6	17.6
Greenville	22	68	218	206	276	790	607	76.8	183	23.2
Greenwood	1	14	40	38	72	165	137	83.0	28	17.0

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE III (cont.)

ARRESTS BY COUNTY
BY AGE AND SEX

County	<u>AGE</u>						<u>SEX</u>			
	10 & under	11 & 12	13 & 14	15	16	Total	Male No.	Male %	Female No.	Female %
Hampton	0	0	2	0	2	4	2	50.0	2	50.0
Horry	11	21	91	146	256	525	424	80.8	101	19.2
Jasper	0	1	13	10	14	38	22	57.9	16	42.1
Kershaw	0	2	39	32	41	114	73	64.0	41	36.0
Lancaster	6	6	18	18	28	76	63	82.9	13	17.1
Laurens	0	8	9	13	25	55	45	81.8	10	18.2
Lee	0	0	10	1	0	11	11	100.0	0	0
Lexington	4	8	73	58	85	228	149	65.4	79	34.6
Marion	0	3	17	13	19	52	49	94.2	3	5.8
Marlboro	0	0	4	12	16	32	23	71.9	9	28.1
McCormick	0	0	2	1	11	14	14	100.0	0	0
Newberry	0	4	6	6	9	25	19	76.0	6	24.0
Oconee	1	1	11	7	5	25	20	80.0	5	20.0
Orangeburg	4	10	56	28	26	124	106	85.5	18	14.5
Pickens	0	5	34	34	77	150	117	78.0	33	22.0
Richland	76	197	530	370	428	1,601	1,234	77.1	367	22.9
Saluda	3	1	5	9	6	24	17	70.8	7	29.2
Spartanburg	27	57	189	165	194	632	427	67.6	205	32.4
Sumter	68	78	125	90	103	464	387	83.4	77	16.6
Union	2	9	17	33	59	120	94	78.3	26	21.7
Williamsburg	0	0	2	0	6	8	5	62.5	3	37.5
York	10	26	105	103	124	368	259	70.4	109	29.6
STATE TOTAL	321	750	2,432	2,116	2,925	8,544	6,548	76.6	1,996	23.4

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE IV

ARRESTS STATEWIDE BY AGE AND SEX

1976-1977 Comparison

	<u>AGE</u>												<u>SEX</u>					
	10 & under		11 & 12		13 & 14		15		16		TOTAL		Male		Female		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1976	445	4.13	980	9.10	3027	28.11	2714	25.20	3601	33.44	10,767	100.00	8220	76.3	2547	23.7	10,767	100.00
1977	321	3.76	750	8.78	2432	28.46	2116	24.77	2925	34.23	8,544	100.00	6548	76.6	1996	23.4	8,544	100.00
% Raw Difference		-27.9		-23.5		-19.7		-22.0		-18.8		-20.65		-20.3		-21.6		-20.65

MEAN AGE

1976 14.325

1977 14.363

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE V

ARRESTS BY COUNTY BY RACE

County	No.	<u>White</u> Percentage	No.	<u>Black</u> Percentage	No.	<u>Other</u> Percentage	No.	<u>TOTAL</u> Percentage
Abbeville	26	54.2	22	45.8	0	0	48	100.0
Aiken	194	68.8	88	31.2	0	0	282	100.0
Allendale	12	57.1	9	42.9	0	0	21	100.0
Anderson	728	80.8	172	19.1	1	.1	901	100.0
Bamberg	16	51.6	15	48.4	0	0	31	100.0
Barnwell	1	7.1	13	92.9	0	0	14	100.0
Beaufort	92	59.4	62	40.0	1	.6	155	100.0
Berkeley	118	80.8	27	18.5	1	.7	146	100.0
Calhoun	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0	2	100.0
Charleston	1008	50.2	998	49.7	2	.1	2008	100.0
Cherokee	78	79.6	20	20.4	0	0	98	100.0
Chester	37	45.1	45	54.9	0	0	82	100.0
Chesterfield	60	60.6	38	38.4	1	1.0	99	100.0
Clarendon	6	25.0	18	75.0	0	0	24	100.0
Colleton	23	52.3	21	47.7	0	0	44	100.0
Darlington	123	52.6	111	47.4	0	0	234	100.0
Dillon	34	45.9	37	50.0	3	4.1	74	100.0
Dorchester	47	85.5	8	14.5	0	0	55	100.0
Edgefield	12	40.0	18	60.0	0	0	30	100.0
Fairfield	11	40.7	16	59.3	0	0	27	100.0
Florence	163	56.8	124	43.2	0	0	287	100.0
Georgetown	15	25.4	44	74.6	0	0	59	100.0
Greenville	954	73.9	335	25.9	2	.2	1291	100.0
Greenwood	171	61.7	106	38.3	0	0	277	100.0
Hampton	5	45.5	6	54.5	0	0	11	100.0
Horry	1026	87.7	144	12.3	0	0	1170	100.0
Jasper	41	78.8	11	21.2	0	0	52	100.0

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE V (cont.)

ARRESTS BY COUNTY BY RACE

County	No.	<u>White</u> Percentage	No.	<u>Black</u> Percentage	No.	<u>Other</u> Percentage	No.	<u>TOTAL</u> Percentage
Kershaw	140	71.8	55	28.2	0	0	195	100.0
Lancaster	123	71.5	49	28.5	0	0	172	100.0
Laurens	72	67.3	35	32.7	0	0	107	100.0
Lee	7	35.0	13	65.0	0	0	20	100.0
Lexington	332	81.2	76	18.6	1	.2	409	100.0
Marion	28	31.5	61	68.5	0	0	89	100.0
Marlboro	74	67.9	35	32.1	0	0	109	100.0
McCormick	8	40.0	12	60.0	0	0	20	100.0
Newberry	39	51.3	37	48.7	0	0	76	100.0
Oconee	64	76.2	19	22.6	1	1.2	84	100.0
Orangeburg	71	32.9	145	67.1	0	0	216	100.0
Pickens	245	87.2	36	12.8	0	0	281	100.0
Richland	892	41.3	1267	58.6	3	.1	2162	100.0
Saluda	25	52.1	23	47.9	0	0	48	100.0
Spartanburg	655	63.9	368	35.9	2	.2	1025	100.0
Sumter	262	41.2	372	58.5	2	.3	636	100.0
Union	126	57.5	93	42.5	0	0	219	100.0
Williamsburg	8	25.8	23	74.2	0	0	31	100.0
York	400	66.2	203	33.6	1	.2	604	100.0
STATE TOTAL	8573	61.2	5431	38.7	21	.1	14,025	100.0

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE VI

ARRESTS STATEWIDE BY RACE

1976-1977 Comparison

	Number	<u>WHITE</u>	Number	<u>NON-WHITE</u>	TOTAL
		Percentage		Percentage	
1976	8845	62.1	5405	37.9	14,250
1977	8573	61.2	5452	38.8	14,025

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE VII

ARRESTS BY COUNTY BY OFFENSE

County	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28*	29*	TOTAL
Abbeville	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	20
Aiken	0	0	0	0	3	20	33	6	2	0	4	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	16	0	0	2	3	2	3	0	8	0	14	128
Allendale	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
Anderson	1	0	0	3	3	49	124	14	6	0	1	3	0	0	13	3	0	3	59	0	0	6	13	44	29	1	117	1	101	594
Bamberg	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	19
Barnwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	8
Beaufort	0	0	0	2	2	10	17	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	0	3	3	3	1	12	0	4	73
Berkeley	0	0	1	1	2	21	12	5	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	7	0	9	70
Calhoun	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Charleston	3	1	9	19	58	247	496	35	100	3	8	6	0	18	50	16	0	5	53	3	0	5	8	12	74	0	135	0	55	1419
Cherokee	0	0	1	0	0	8	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	2	0	4	36
Chester	0	0	0	1	0	9	23	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	4	0	2	49
Chesterfield	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	34
Clarendon	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Colleton	0	0	4	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	21
Darlington	0	0	3	1	2	26	40	4	4	0	3	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	11	0	0	3	0	7	13	0	24	2	16	166
Dillon	1	0	1	1	2	4	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	0	7	37
Dorchester	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	2	26
Edgefield	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Fairfield	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Florence	0	0	0	1	8	15	56	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	5	0	0	12	0	8	5	0	4	3	6	129
Georgetown	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	34
Greenville	0	1	0	9	11	199	179	24	19	0	2	3	0	13	26	3	0	9	47	0	2	6	5	13	34	0	54	0	131	790
Greenwood	2	0	0	0	0	43	43	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	0	1	8	0	0	6	6	9	5	0	15	0	11	165
Hampton	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Horry	0	0	2	2	6	68	118	9	4	2	7	0	0	2	18	22	0	1	48	0	0	16	50	51	36	0	44	0	19	525
Jasper	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	21	38
Kershaw	0	0	1	0	4	3	10	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	1	6	5	0	38	0	31	114
Lancaster	0	0	0	0	1	14	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	3	1	6	4	0	12	0	7	76

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE VII (cont.)

ARRESTS BY COUNTY BY OFFENSE

County	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28*	29*	TOTAL
Laurens	0	0	0	1	0	10	23	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4	0	5	0	2	55
Lee	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Lexington	0	0	2	2	1	25	18	2	2	1	0	1	0	6	2	0	0	1	11	0	2	5	3	10	4	0	41	0	89	228
Marion	0	0	0	0	3	12	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	3	7	0	9	0	1	52
Marlboro	0	0	0	3	2	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	3	0	2	0	4	32
McCormick	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	14
Newberry	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	2	25
Oconee	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	1	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	25
Orangeburg	0	0	1	0	0	33	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	0	11	0	10	124
Pickens	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	5	2	0	1	2	0	0	5	3	0	0	20	1	1	4	9	5	10	0	27	0	13	150
Richland	2	0	7	22	51	231	407	44	100	2	7	3	0	4	54	11	4	15	32	1	1	7	8	40	95	0	276	47	130	1601
Saluda	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	24
Spartanburg	1	2	0	3	15	70	242	9	6	0	3	3	0	1	18	5	0	4	30	0	2	4	15	29	19	0	54	5	92	632
Sumter	0	0	1	3	2	105	145	11	4	2	1	0	0	0	33	7	0	4	15	0	2	4	10	8	8	0	29	0	70	464
Union	0	0	2	0	0	5	33	0	2	5	4	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	3	5	0	5	9	4	14	0	20	1	3	120
Williamsburg	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	8
York	0	0	0	5	8	63	74	4	8	0	2	0	0	4	16	5	0	1	10	0	0	4	3	10	7	1	114	0	29	368
STATE TOTAL	13	4	35	80	189	1369	2331	201	284	16	50	26	0	59	266	94	4	48	427	10	13	120	159	300	416	3	1080	59	888	8544

KEY TO OFFENSES

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 1) Murder & Non-Negligent Manslaughter | 8) Motor Vehicle Theft | 15) Vandalism | 22) Driving Under the Influence |
| 2) Manslaughter | 9) Other Assaults | 16) Weapons--carrying, possessing, etc. | 23) Liquor Laws |
| 3) Forcible Rape | 10) Arson | 17) Prostitution & Commercial Vice | 24) Drunkenness |
| 4) Robbery | 11) Forgery and Counterfeiting | 18) Sex Offenses | 25) Disorderly Conduct |
| 5) Aggravated Assault | 12) Fraud | 19) Drug Abuse Violation | 26) Vagrancy |
| 6) Breaking & Entering | 13) Embezzlement | 20) Gambling | 27) Other |
| 7) Larceny-theft (except motor vehicle) | 14) Stolen Property--buying, rec., possessing | 21) Offenses Against Family & Children | *28) Curfew & Loitering Laws |
| | | | *29) Runaway |

*Only Status Offenses Reported

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE VIII

ARRESTS STATEWIDE BY OFFENSE

1976-1977 Comparison

Offense	<u>1976</u>		<u>1977</u>		% of Raw Difference
	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total	
Murder & Non-Negligent Manslaughter	10	.09	13	.15	+30.0
Manslaughter	6	.06	4	.05	-33.3
Forcible Rape	38	.35	35	.41	- 7.9
Robbery	92	.85	80	.94	-13.04
Aggravated Assault	244	2.27	189	2.21	-22.54
Breaking & Entering	1579	14.67	1369	16.02	-13.3
Larceny-theft (except motor vehicle)	2827	26.26	2331	27.28	-17.54
Motor Vehicle Theft	275	2.55	201	2.35	-23.27
Other Assaults	200	1.86	284	3.32	+42.0
Arson	26	.24	16	.19	-38.46
Forgery and Counterfeiting	44	.41	50	.59	+13.64
Fraud	23	.21	26	.30	+13.04
Embezzlement	0	0	0	0	0
Stolen Property--buying, rec., possessing	77	.72	59	.69	-23.38
Vandalism	422	3.92	266	3.11	-36.97
Weapons--carrying, possessing, etc.	86	.8	94	1.10	+ 9.3
Prostitution and Commercial Vice	6	.06	4	.05	-33.3
Sex Offenses	43	.4	48	.56	+11.63
Drug Abuse Violation	560	5.2	427	5.0	-23.75
Gambling	6	.06	10	.12	+66.67
Offenses Against Family and Children	122	1.13	13	.15	-89.34

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE VIII (cont.)

ARRESTS STATEWIDE BY OFFENSE

1976-1977 Comparison

Offense	<u>1976</u>		<u>1977</u>		% of Raw Difference
	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total	
Driving Under the Influence	95	.88	120	1.4	+26.32
Liquor Laws	136	1.26	159	1.86	+16.91
Drunkenness	390	3.62	300	3.51	-23.08
Disorderly Conduct	579	5.38	416	4.87	-28.15
Vagrancy	39	.36	3	.04	-92.3
Other	1460	13.56	1080	12.64	-26.03
Curfew and Loitering Laws	123	1.14	59	.69	-52.0
Runaway	1259	11.69	888	10.39	-29.5
TOTAL	10,767	100.00	8,544	99.99	-20.6

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE IX

ARRESTS BY COUNTY
BY POLICE DISPOSITION

County	Handled Within Dept. & Released		Referred to Juvenile Court or Probation Dept.		Referred to Welfare Agency		Referred to other Police Agency		Referred to Criminal or Adult Court		TOTAL
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Abbeville	4	20.0	16	80.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Aiken	45	35.2	83	64.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Allendale	2	28.6	4	57.1	1	14.3	0	0	0	0	7
Anderson	271	45.6	316	53.2	3	.5	3	.5	1	.2	594
Bamberg	4	21.1	15	78.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Barnwell	0	0	8	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Beaufort	8	11.0	65	89.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Berkeley	5	7.1	65	92.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Calhoun	1	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Charleston	249	17.5	1168	82.3	1	.1	1	.1	0	0	1419
Cherokee	14	38.9	20	55.6	2	5.5	0	0	0	0	36
Chester	3	6.1	46	93.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Chesterfield	5	14.7	27	79.4	2	5.9	0	0	0	0	34
Clarendon	0	0	4	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Colleton	6	28.5	13	61.9	1	4.8	0	0	1	4.8	21
Darlington	15	9.0	149	89.8	0	0	0	0	2	1.2	166
Dillon	5	13.5	32	86.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Dorchester	6	23.1	20	76.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Edgefield	3	18.8	13	81.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Fairfield	1	12.5	7	87.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Florence	16	12.4	112	86.8	0	0	0	0	1	.8	129
Georgetown	1	2.9	31	91.2	0	0	0	0	2	5.9	34
Greenville	142	18.0	642	81.3	4	.5	2	.2	0	0	790
Greenwood	17	10.3	142	86.1	4	2.4	0	0	2	1.2	165
Hampton	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE IX (cont.)

ARRESTS BY COUNTY
BY POLICE DISPOSITION

County	Handled Within Dept. & Released		Referred to Juvenile Court or Probation Dept.		Referred to Welfare Agency		Referred to other Police Agency		Referred to Criminal or Adult Court		TOTAL
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Horry	165	31.4	352	67.0	3	.6	2	.4	3	.6	525
Jasper	24	63.2	12	31.6	0	0	0	0	2	5.2	38
Kershaw	10	8.8	104	91.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
Lancaster	12	15.8	64	84.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Laurens	14	25.5	41	74.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Lee	0	0	11	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Lexington	13	5.7	215	94.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	228
Marion	17	32.7	35	67.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Marlboro	4	12.5	28	87.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
McCormick	1	7.1	13	92.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Newberry	3	12.0	22	88.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Oconee	5	20.0	20	80.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Orangeburg	29	23.4	93	75.0	0	0	1	.8	1	.8	124
Pickens	45	30.0	100	66.7	1	.7	0	0	4	2.6	150
Richland	643	40.2	942	58.8	5	.3	8	.5	3	.2	1601
Saluda	4	16.7	20	83.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Spartanburg	37	5.8	590	93.4	3	.4	1	.2	1	.2	632
Sumter	103	22.2	357	76.9	2	.4	1	.2	1	.2	464
Union	24	20.0	96	80.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Williamsburg	0	0	8	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
York	31	8.4	336	91.3	0	0	1	.3	0	0	368
STATE TOTAL	2009	23.5	6459	75.6	32	.4	20	.2	24	.3	8544

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE X

ARRESTS & DETENTION

1976-1977 Comparison

County	<u>DETENTION</u>				<u>ARRESTS</u>			
	1976	1977	%	Raw Change	1976	1977	%	Raw Change
Abbeville	8	4	-	50.	30	20	-	33.3
Aiken	273	252	-	7.7	337	128	-	62.0
Allendale	28	16	-	42.9	7	7		0
Anderson	357	391	+	9.5	585	594	+	1.5
Bamberg	1	3	+	200.0	8	19	+	137.5
Barnwell	6	15	+	150.0	3	8	+	166.7
Beaufort	125	112	-	10.4	179	73	-	59.2
Berkeley	207	225	+	8.7	296	70	-	76.4
Calhoun	0	0		0	4	1	-	75.0
Charleston	920	853	-	7.3	1418	1419	+	.07
Cherokee	10	20	+	100.0	20	36	+	80.0
Chester	137	139	+	1.5	79	49	-	38.0
Chesterfield	51	79	+	54.9	39	34	-	12.8
Clarendon	28	50	+	78.6	8	4	-	50.0
Colleton	186	134	-	28.0	25	21	-	16.0
Darlington	95	138	+	45.3	187	166	-	11.2
Dillon	93	121	+	30.1	67	37	-	44.8
Dorchester	67	161	+	140.3	34	26	-	23.5
Edgefield	0	0		0	18	16	-	11.1
Fairfield	2	4	+	100.0	8	8		0
Florence	346	308	-	11.0	227	129	-	43.2
Georgetown	24	44	+	83.3	43	34	-	20.9
Greenville	420	352	-	16.2	1201	790	-	34.2
Greenwood	102	99	-	2.9	240	165	-	31.3
Hampton	21	15	-	28.6	41	4	-	90.2
Horry	664	624	-	6.0	656	525	-	20.0
Jasper	31	50	+	61.3	28	38	+	35.7
Kershaw	295	270	-	8.5	121	114	-	5.8
Lancaster	106	146	+	37.7	114	76	-	33.3
Laurens	60	38	-	36.7	128	55	-	57.0
Lee	21	19	-	9.5	14	11	-	21.4
Lexington	357	386	+	8.1	237	228	-	3.8
McCormick	2	18	+	800.0	6	14	+	133.3
Marion	53	37	-	30.2	80	52	-	40.0
Marlboro	74	75	+	1.4	87	32	-	63.2
Newberry	20	39	+	95.0	22	25	+	13.6
Oconee	55	30	-	45.5	39	25	-	35.9
Orangeburg	108	51	-	52.8	185	124	-	33.0
Pickens	183	129	-	29.5	191	150	-	21.5
Richland	1376	1249	-	9.2	2035	1601	-	21.3
Saluda	18	21	+	16.7	20	24	+	20.0
Spartanburg	330	411	+	24.5	853	632	-	25.9
Sumter	163	192	+	17.8	255	464	+	82.0
Union	31	41	+	32.3	184	120	-	34.8
Williamsburg	12	18	+	50.0	15	8	-	46.7
York	255	306	+	20.0	393	368	-	6.4
STATE TOTAL	7721	7690	-	.4	10,767	8544	-	20.6

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE XI

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM COMPONENTS
POPULATION RATES COMPARISON

Juvenile Justice Component	Number	Estimated Juvenile Population 1976	Rate
Juvenile Arrests - (UCR)	8,544	512,519 (7-16)	1.67
Juvenile Jail Detention	7,690	512,519 (7-16)	1.50
Juvenile Court Referrals*	16,025	512,519 (7-16)	3.1
Commitments to R&E Center	1,635	374,898 (10-16)	.44
Commitments to Correctional Schools	662	374,898 (10-16)	.18

*Reasonable estimate only according to data available.

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE XII

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM COMPONENTS
AGE, RACE AND SEX COMPARISON RATES

Juvenile Population	RACE %		SEX %		AGE							
	White	Black	Male	Female	Mean Age	Modal Age	10 & un.	11 & 12	Age Groupings %		15	16
									13 & 14			
Arrests - 1977	61.2	38.7	76.6	23.4	14.43	16	3.8	8.8	28.4	24.8	34.2	
Detention - 1977	64.0	36.0	71.0	29.0	14.7	16	1.8	6.1	28.0	27.3	36.8	
*Courts - FY 1977 (Based on 13,036 referrals)	65.9	34.1	73.8	26.2	14.3	16	5.2	9.0	27.2	24.8	33.9	
R & E Center Commitments - 1977	56.0	44.0	73.8	26.2	14.6*	15*	1.0*	7.7*	31.1*	29.6*	29.5*	
Correctional School Commitments - 1977	46.8	53.2	83.6	16.4	15.0*	16*	.3*	3.3*	29.2*	27.1*	34.3*	
Juvenile Population - 1977	62.4	37.3	50.7	49.3	11.7	16	36.3	20.8	21.0	10.6	11.3	

*Fiscal Year figures - only available data

JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE XIII

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM COMPONENTS
STATUS AND NON-STATUS OFFENDERS COMPARISON

	<u>TOTAL</u>		<u>STATUS</u>		<u>NON-STATUS</u>	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Arrests (UCR)	8,544	100.0	947	11.1	7,597	88.9
Detention	7,690	100.0	2,088	27.2	5,602	72.8
*Courts - FY 1977 (Based on 14,703 offenses as recorded)	14,703	100.0	4,323	29.4	10,380	70.6
R & E Center Admissions	1,635	100.0	447	27.3	1,188	72.7
Correctional Schools	662	100.0	48	7.3	614	92.7

*only offenses and not offenders recorded accurately



JUVENILES TAKEN INTO CUSTODY - 1977

TABLE XIV

LAW ENFORCEMENT REFERRALS TO COURT
AND
COURT REFERRALS FROM LAW ENFORCEMENT - FY1977
SAMPLE COMPARISON

County	<u>Uniform Crime</u> <u>Report</u>	<u>Disposition</u> <u>to Court</u>		<u>Court</u>	<u>Referrals From</u> <u>Law Enforcement</u>	
	Total Referrals	No.	%	Total Referrals	No.	%
Aiken	241	180	74.7	637	412	64.7
Anderson	615	356	57.9	963	413	42.9
Beaufort	155	97	62.6	727	512	70.4
Clarendon	5	4	80.0	565	487	86.2
Florence	195	148	75.9	484	247	51.0
Greenville	1019	893	87.6	1248	1148	92.0
Kershaw	120	74	61.7	438	259	59.1
Lexington	189	160	84.7	885	249	28.1
Orangeburg	192	142	74.0	348	153	44.0
Spartanburg	735	656	89.3	1522	691	45.4
Sumter	412	260	63.1	566	349	61.7
York	299	270	90.3	399	258	64.7
TOTAL SAMPLE	4177	3240	77.6	8782	5178	59.0
ALL STATE TOTALS RECORDED	9617	6741	70.1	13,244	7478	56.5